

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-14, 16-35, 37-40 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 16, 18, 27 and 37 are independent. By this Amendment, the independent claims are amended. No new matter is added.

Claims 1-3, 5-14, 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,407,821 to Hohensee et al. ("Hohensee") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0171856 A1 to Ackerman et al. ("Ackerman"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to an image forming device for receiving a document file that has not been converted into Page Description Language (PDL) format and forming images of said document file. The document file contains a plurality of pages and a plurality of unconverted objects for displaying a part or all of the contents of each page of the document and being capable of lining up in the file regardless of the order of the contents displayed in said document. The image forming device comprises, *inter alia*, a receiving unit for successively receiving unconverted constituent data of a document file from an external device, and an image forming unit for forming images of the specific page before all of the unconverted constituent data of the document file have been received from the external device and regardless of whether the unconverted objects are arranged according to page number of the document file when it is judged by the judging unit that all objects necessary for displaying the specific page are stored in the storing unit. Independent Claims 8 and 16 recite similar features.

The Office Action acknowledges that Hohensee fails to disclose an image forming unit for forming images of the specific page before all of the unconverted constituent data of the document file have been received. The Office Action takes the position that these features are disclosed by Ackerman.

However, Claim 1, 8 and 16 now define that the image forming device receives a document file that has not been converted into Page Description Language (PDL) format, and that the image forming unit forms images of the specific page before all of the unconverted constituent data of the document file have been received *and regardless of whether the unconverted objects are arranged according to page number of the document file.*

Ackerman discloses that its printer 10 is compatible with the Page Description Language formats PostScript and PCL (see paragraph [0061] of Ackerman). In these formats, the document contents are arranged in the order in which they are to be printed. In this regard, the Official Action says that the printer 10 may initiate printing of a document when the printer 10 receives a one-page portion of the print data (i.e., without receiving the entire print data). However, before all unconverted constituent data of the document file have been received, Ackerman's printer 10 does not begin printing the document file when the objects for displaying the contents of each page of the document file are *not* arranged according to page number. Accordingly, Ackerman fails to disclose or suggest that the printer 10 prints a specific page before all unconverted constituent data of the document file have been received *and regardless of whether unconverted objects are arranged according to page number of the document file.*

Thus, the combination of Hohensee and Ackerman fails to disclose, and would not have rendered obvious, the claimed combination of features, including an

image forming unit for forming images of the specific page before all of the unconverted constituent data of the document file have been received from the external device and regardless of whether the unconverted objects are arranged according to page number of the document file as recited in independent Claim 1, and similarly recited in independent Claims 8 and 16. Therefore, independent Claims 1, 8 and 16 are patentable over Hohensee and Ackerman for at least these reasons.

Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9-14 and 17 are patentable over Hohensee and Ackerman at least by virtue of their respective dependence from the patentable independent claims. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in these dependent claims is not set forth at this time. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects Claims 4 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hohensee in view of Ackerman, and further in view of JP-A-09-174955 to Abe. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Abe fails to overcome the deficiencies of Hohensee and Ackerman. Therefore, Claims 4 and 11 are patentable over Hohensee and Abe at least by virtue of their dependence from patentable independent Claims 1 and 8, respectively. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in these dependent claims is not set forth at this time. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 18, 19, 23-28, 32-35, 37 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hohensee in view of Ackerman, and further in view of Abe. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 18 is directed to an image forming device comprising, *inter alia*, a receiving unit for successively receiving constituent data of the document file from an external device before the constituent data is converted into print data, and an image forming unit for forming images of objects stored in the storing unit before all of the unconverted constituent data of the document file have been received from the external device *and regardless of the order displayed in the document*.

Independent Claims 27 and 37 recite similar features.

As discussed above, Ackerman's printer 10 is compatible with the Page Description Language formats PostScript and PCL (see paragraph [0061] of Ackerman). In PostScript and PCL formats, the document contents are arranged in the order in which they are to be printed. However, Ackerman's printer 10 does not begin printing the document file when the objects for displaying the contents of each page of the document file are *not* arranged according to the order displayed in the document. Accordingly, Ackerman fails to disclose or suggest that the printer 10 prints a specific page before all of the unconverted constituent data of the document file have been received from the external device *and regardless of the order displayed in said document*. Thus, Ackerman fails to disclose an image forming unit for forming images of objects stored in the storing unit before all of the unconverted constituent data of the document file have been received from an external device *and regardless of the order displayed in said document* as recited in independent Claim 18, and similarly recited in independent Claims 27 and 37.

Further, Abe fails to overcome the deficiencies of Ackerman, and the Office Action acknowledges that Hohensee fails to disclose the claimed image forming unit. Thus, independent Claims 18, 27 and 37 are patentable over the combination of Hohensee, Ackerman and Abe for at least these reasons.

Claims 19, 23-26, 28, 32-35 and 38 are patentable over Hohensee, Ackerman and Abe at least by virtue of their respective dependence from the patentable independent claims. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in these dependent claims is not set forth at this time. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects Claims 20-22 and 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hohensee in view of Ackerman and Abe, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0216048 A1 to Brown et al. ("Brown"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Brown fails to overcome the deficiencies of Hohensee, Ackerman and Abe. Therefore, Claims 20-22 and 29-31 are patentable over the applied references at least by virtue of their dependence from patentable independent Claims 18 and 27, respectively. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in these dependent claims is not set forth at this time. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects Claims 39 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hohensee in view of Ackerman, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0067502 A1 to Hansen. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hansen fails to overcome the deficiencies of Hohensee and Ackerman. Thus, Claims 39 and 40 are patentable over the applied references at least by virtue of their dependence from patentable independent Claim 1. Therefore, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in these dependent claims is not set forth at this time. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful

in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: October 18, 2010

By: /David R. Kemeny/
David R. Kemeny
Registration No. 57241

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620